DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 082 CE 017 953

AUTHOR Pressley, Calvin; McGraw, James
TITLE Classroom Training--The CIC Approach: CETA Program Models.
INSTITUTION Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 28p.; Notational and quoted information in this document may not reproduce well due to small type
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 029-000-00329-7)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Community Programs; Cooperative Programs; Employment Problems; *Employment Programs; Federal Programs; Manpower Development; *Models; *Off the Job Training; Program Evaluation; *Public Service Occupations; Unemployed; Unemployment
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment Training Act; United States

ABSTRACT

This monograph on Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) program models for practitioners in community-based government employment and training programs describes a model for classroom job training, the Opportunities Industrial Centers (OIC) model. The content is presented in five sections. The introductory section discusses motivations for classroom training, classroom training in employment and training programs, the OIC approach, and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Section 2 covers the advantages, disadvantages, and preconsiderations for classroom training. The third section discusses the ingredients of classroom teaching, including client-centered instruction, team teaching and assessment, and interagency linkages. The next section, presenting a profile of classroom training, covers the training environment, instructors and job relatedness, open entry/open exit, and individualized instruction. Section 5 concludes with patterns for classroom training and includes pre-employment classroom training, classroom/work experience training, post-employment training, and evaluation of classroom training. (EM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Classroom Training—The OIC Approach: CETA Program Models

U.S. Department of Labor
Ray Marshall, Secretary

Employment and Training Administration
Ernest G. Green
Assistant Secretary for Employment
and Training
1978

ED162082

CE 017 953

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SPECIAL NOTE

This monograph is one of a series entitled *CETA Program Models* prepared for the Employment and Training Administration's Office of Community Employment Programs, with financial support by the Office of Research and Development. The series, on program activities and services, was prepared under contract number 81-11-71-09 with the National Council on Employment Policy and edited by Garth Mangum of the University of Utah.

The monographs being issued or prepared for publication are *On-the-Job Training* by James Bromley and Larry Wardle; *Job Development and Placement* by Miriam Johnson and Marged Sugarman; *Classroom Training--The OIC Approach* by Calvin Pressley and James McGraw; *Supportive Services* by Susan Turner and Carolyn Conradus; *Intake and Assessment* by Lee Bruno; *Work Experience Perspectives* by Marion Pines and James Morlock; and *Public Service Employment* by Ray Corpuz. Others may be added as circumstances warrant.

The authors, experienced employment and training program operators themselves, review the purposes and means of carrying out CETA functions and comment on methods they have found useful in conducting programs and avoiding pitfalls. The series is commended not only to program operators and their staffs, but also to community groups and other employment and training services professionals in the hope that this information will enable more people to learn about CETA programs, stimulate new ideas, and contribute to improving the quality of employment and training programs.

The series should not be regarded as official policy or requirements of the U.S. Department of Labor. Although every effort has been made to assure that the information is consistent with present regulations, prime sponsors are urged to consult current regulations before adopting changes the authors may advocate. The authors are solely responsible for the content.

Another series of use to CETA prime sponsors and their staffs is *CETA Title VI Project Description Reports*. There are two volumes in this series. The first monograph was prepared by MDC, Inc., Chapel Hill, N.C., under contract number 82-37-71-47. The second volume was prepared by ETA with assistance from prime sponsors, regional offices, and a private contractor.

Copies of other titles in these series may be obtained from:

Office of Community Employment Programs
Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Department of Labor
601 D Street, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20213

Reader comments and suggestions are welcomed and may be sent to the above address.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock No. 029-000-00329-7

The designation "employment and training" reflects a debate that has persisted throughout the history of these programs. Should the emphasis be on employability or employment? Which holds the greater promise of a sucessful working career for a disadvantaged person? Underlying that debate is another: Are employability skills best developed on the job or in training institutions?

Opportunities Industrialization Centers (OIC's) were started to meet the challenge posed by employers being boycotted by the black community in Philadelphia, which felt they discriminated against black workers in hiring. In response to employer promises to hire black residents who had the needed skills, centers were set up to provide classroom training. As OIC expanded to become a nationwide community-based organization, it retained its preference for this type of training. However, the OIC method involves considerably more than teaching occupational skills. Underlying its approach is the belief that the greatest obstacle faced by most disadvantaged persons is lack of pride and self-confidence. A classroom setting gives instructors the opportunity to accompany and even precede skill training with instruction in race pride, grooming, and personal development. Motivation is the objective of the Feeder Program, which is the key component of the OIC approach to classroom training.

The OIC model is not the only or the most universally accepted model for classroom training, just as classroom training is not always the preferred type of training. But the OIC model is a widely used one, and there is strong evidence of its success with the appropriate clientele under the right circumstances and with committed administrators. Hence every practitioner of the employment and training arts should be familiar with the OIC philosophy and its implications for training practice.

Cal Pressley and Jim McGraw are able advocates of that philosophy. Pressley is the executive director of Opportunities Industrialization Center of Greater New York, Inc., and McGraw is managing editor of *The Adherent*, a professional journal published by the OIC Executive Directors Association.

As with all other monographs in this series, the author's views and experience are presented for other practitioners to gather and adopt what they find useful.

Garth L. Mangum
Series Editor

4

CONTENTS

	Page
Special Note	ii
Foreword	iii
1. Introduction	1
Motivations for Classroom Training	1
Classroom Training in Employment and Training Programs	2
The OIC Approach	3
The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act	3
2. Advantages, Disadvantages, and Preconsiderations for Classroom Training	5
The Case for Classroom Training	5
The Qualitative Aspects	5
As a Holding Pattern	6
Program Independence	6
The Disadvantages of Classroom Training	7
Lack of Flexibility	7
Information Requirements	7
Where Are the Jobs?	7
Cautions to Program Designers	8
Industry Involvement	8
The Nature of Disadvantagement	9
For Which Occupational Skills?	10
The Qualifications of Instructors	10
Stipends: To Pay or Not to Pay?	11
3. Ingredients of Classroom Training	13
Client-Centered Instruction	13
What It Is	13
The Trainer's Attitude	13
The Language Problem	14
Team Teaching and Assessment	14
The Role of the Counselor	14
Accountability and Feedback	15
Esprit de Corps	15
Interagency Linkages	16

Page

4. A Profile of Classroom Training 17
The Training Environment 17
Instructors and Job Relatedness 17
Open Entry/Open Exit 18
Individualized Instruction 18

5. Patterns for Classroom Training 21
Pre-Employment Classroom Training 21
Classroom/Work Experience Training 21
Post-Employment Training 22
Evaluation of Classroom Training 22
Evaluation Levels 22
Evaluation Criteria 22
Dangers of Inadequate Criteria 23
Competition Among Training Services 24

1. INTRODUCTION

The operative idea in writing this paper was, "If you were to advise the staff director of a new CETA prime sponsor on how to handle classroom training, what would you say?" The authors tried to sort out the accumulated gripes and conventional wisdoms expressed about the field: That there's more to classroom training than meets the eye; that there are temptations and pitfalls that must be avoided; that prime sponsors and the clientele they are supposed to serve must be true partners in the training process; and that classroom training in employment and training programs ought to make a contribution to real vocational preparation that will revitalize, reorient, and help restructure the educational system and educational understanding of the United States.

This paper considers some basic questions: Why is classroom training both desirable and necessary? Who is best suited for classroom training? What subjects and vocational skills are best taught in the classroom? Which ones require a different approach and setting? How should classroom training be conducted? Where and when should classroom training take place? In attempting to answer such questions, this paper relies heavily and consciously upon the classroom training experience and philosophy of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers, recognizing that the OIC pattern is but one approach among many used by community-based and government training programs. But it is the one the authors know best and to which they are committed.

Motivations for Classroom Training

Classroom training became a component of the employment and training programs of the 1960's in part because traditional educational preparation was found noticeably lacking on two accounts. First, there was a lack of linkages between public school, college, and university classrooms and the real world of work. Because they could not obtain adequately trained new personnel from traditional educational programs, business and industry became increasingly involved in the training process. More often than not, some kind of on-the-job training was necessary after hiring to transform new employees into knowledgeable and productive workers. Even though passing through some stage of the traditional education process was usually a requirement for *getting* a job, something more was required to enable a person to actually *perform* that job.

Second, a substantial segment of those who entered the traditional education system were not reached by its efforts for one reason or another. In large part, those unreachables came from the ranks of the poor, most often from minority ethnic groups. They comprised a societal subgroup called "the disadvantaged." They came to the public school classrooms with a unique mix of special problems—poverty, deprivation, and isolation from opportunity. The public school classroom was often as foreign to disadvantaged students as their own life struggles were to many of those who taught there. The assumptions, the language, and the methodologies of the traditional public school classroom were not geared to communicate with the most severely disadvantaged students and inspire them with high levels of aspiration and vocational potential. As most people do when they find themselves in a situation where they are not understood and feel uncomfortable, disadvantaged students removed themselves in large numbers from the uncomfortable situation. Some call them "dropouts," while others prefer the term "pushouts."

Whether by insensitivity or design, the traditional education system seemed to be geared toward educating the top quarter of its students—not necessarily the brightest students, but rather those who were willing and able to adapt to the desires and demands of the system itself. Nondisruptive students—those who accepted the rules of proper conduct, who were willing and attentive listeners, and who faithfully completed assigned homework—were likely to get ahead. Students who were considered uncooperative or hostile were encouraged out of the system.

If such students did not take the initiative in removing themselves from the classroom, they were frequently shunted into special schools or special classes, where, being branded as misfits, they soon came to accept that stigma as the true measure of their own worth and potential in life. Guidance counseling and pupil placement were most often based upon a

student's prior academic record (that is, the success pattern designed by the existing system) rather than on an unbiased, sincere attempt to evaluate each individual student's personal ambitions and personal potential. Yet with all of these shortcomings, the classroom was still an essential setting in the learning process. It could not be abandoned; how could it be made more effective?

Classroom Training in Employment and Training Programs

Long term conflicts related to the disparity between the skill needs of the labor market and the objectives set for itself by a schooling system dominated by those trained and employed in "higher" education characterize the history of vocational education, a history that need not be recounted here. It is sufficient to say that classroom training originated as an attempt to build connections with the labor market for those not prepared for employment by other educational forms. As the pool of those without successful connections to the labor market grew during the post-World War II years, classroom training efforts were accelerated accordingly. The pace of technological advance, which created a need for new and more technical skills in business and industry, also created an ever larger subgroup of the unskilled, uneducated, and unemployable who were unconnected to the labor market. Many of those in the subgroup were neither dropouts nor pushouts from the high schools. They simply had not gone to high school. This was especially true of adults who had migrated to northern metropolitan areas from the South during the Great Depression or during World War II and the post-war era. For many such persons, a high school education was not a requirement, often not an option, and frequently not even a consideration.

During the 1950's, rising unemployment continued to mock the platitudes written into the Employment Act of 1946. The decade of the 1960's produced further legislation designed to develop human resources. Almost annually throughout the decade, federal legislation was enacted to provide additional training and work experiences in the hope that the unemployed and unemployable might somehow be connected to the labor market. This legislation included the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) of 1962, the Vocational Educational Education Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII), several amendments to MDTA and EOA, the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, and the 1968 amendments to the Vocational Education Act.

Under MDTA, classroom training became accepted and supported by federal funds as a possible way of connecting the unconnected to the labor market.[1] MDTA classroom training took three forms: (1) Single-occupation, class-size projects; (2) multi-occupation projects, usually in skills centers; and (3) individual referral to ongoing vocational courses. Single-occupation classes were initially designed to retrain potentially employable persons whose skills had become obsolete. An occupation offering "reasonable expectation of employment" would be identified, a course in it would be scheduled in an existing vocational training institution, and eligible unemployed persons would be referred to it. However, the single-occupation classroom approach suffered severe limitations. Potential trainees had no real occupational choice. They took the preselected MDTA offerings or else remained in the ranks of the unemployed and unemployable. Since there was no open entry and open exit framework, slots vacated by program dropouts remained vacant until the course was completed, perhaps for as long as six months.

Most devastating to meeting real human resource development needs, many school dropouts, or pushouts, and others in need of remedial training were unlikely to profit greatly from the training because the offerings and settings were little different from those in which they had already failed Classroom training programs also operated under the restraints of limited funds and limiting guidelines. Training was expected to be conducted at low per capita costs and in occupational areas with "reasonable expectation of employment," which too often translated into high turnover occupations. MDTA training focused primarily upon automotive repair, auto body repair, welding, production machine operation, office occupations, food services, and health occupations.

Skills centers were developed out of this experience to broaden the range of occupational choice and to combine supportive services with skills training. From five to twenty-five occupations might be taught in the same facility with the enrollee undergoing an orientation phase before being channeled into the most appropriate occupational area. Advocacy counseling, remedial basic education, English as a second language, placement, and supportive services were available at the training site. However, many of the skills centers fell short of that ideal. Training was often given in inferior facilities, using old and sometimes outdated equipment. The term "disadvantaged" all too often described both the training environment and its clientele. The limited number of training slots available meant that most of the time enrollees were assigned to the slots that were open rather than those they might have preferred.

Toward the end of the MDTA decade, there was a growing tendency to refer individuals to on-going postsecondary vocational training activities. This had the advantage of bringing MDTA enrollees into mainstream institutions. But the individuals referred had to be sufficiently capable to be trained without supportive services and to compete with their less disadvantaged classmates.

But in spite of these and other built-in obstacles, new concepts and new approaches were introduced into the

[1]The following material on skills training under MDTA is based upon the description and evaluation found in Garth L. Mangum and John Walsh, *A Decade of Manpower Development and Training* (Salt Lake City: Olympus Pulishing Co., 1973).

classroom. Individualized instruction allowed a student to learn at his or her own pace rather than feeling the pressure to keep up with the progress of peers. An open entry and open exit policy enabled trainees to enter the program at any point during the year and to leave whenever they were ready for employment. The cluster approach trained enrollees in a broad skill area from which they could be placed in several specific occupations. Categories of occupational expertise were recognized, and trainees were permitted to "spin off" into employment at different occupational levels. In short, a new understanding of the possibilities and potential of classroom training came into being and into practice.

The OIC Approach

Along with MDTA multi-occupational facilities and skills centers, community-based skills training efforts, such as Operation SER (Services, Employment, and Redevelopment) and the Opportunities Industrialization Centers, were established. Organized in Philadelphia in 1964, OIC grew to more than a hundred training centers in local communities throughout the country. The OIC classroom training model was developed in response to local employment conditions and training needs in Philadelphia and came as a result of a series of consumer boycotts (called the Selective Patronage Campaign) directed at companies that discriminated against black workers in their hiring practics. The Selective Patronage Campaign sucessfully opened new job slots, but job-ready black workers were not immediately available to fill the new job openings. Bernard E. Anderson described the problem as follows: "Although most workers develop skills on the job, the worker must exhibit a minimum level of basic education and a capacity to be trained in order to be successful. Because of long years of discrimination and exposure to poor public school education, many black job applicants did not have the necessary skills and industrial orientation to qualify for even the entry level jobs."[2]

Three fundamental principles provided the foundation for the first OIC classroom training effort and remain the cornerstone of the OIC philosophy and training model in centers throughout the country. First, training must be directed toward serving the needs of the "whole" person and must emphasize attitudinal development and motivation along with the acquisition of marketable skills. Second, training must lead to good jobs with a future—jobs that pay decent wages and offer the opportunity for career advancement. Such training requires a close working relationship with business and industry to determine what skills should be taught, what kind of equipment is necessary, and what skills will be needed in the future labor market. Finally, the classroom training program must have the support, counsel, and input of local community representatives in its design and operation.[3]

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

With the enactment of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973, the decision-making focus of employment and training was shifted substantially from Washington, D.C., to municipalities, counties, and regions throughout the country. Federal funds were no longer given categorically to individual training projects, but were given instead to local prime sponsors to distribute according to manpower plans they themselves developed for their particular areas. Use of CETA funds were authorized under five titles, with a sixth title being added in late 1974 to establish a temporary nationwide public service employment program.

Title I provided funds for comprehensive employment and training services through local prime sponsors. Title II provided for transitional public service employment in areas of high unemployment. Title III provided funds for programs serving the needs of specific population segments, such as youth, native Americans, and migrant workers. Title IV continued the Job Corps, and Title V established the National Commission for Manpower Policy, an independent advisory group to the Secretary of Labor and Congress.

At the outset of CETA implementation, more funds seemed to be available for classroom training than had been accessible under the former categorical approach. Programs that had the structure and experience to put funds to immediate use had little difficulty getting classroom training dollars.

But the initial prosperity was short lived. The launching of CETA and the beginning of the 1974 recession were coincidental but simultaneous. Budget cutbacks in major cities caused massive layoffs of municipal workers, and some prime sponsors began using CETA funds illegally to rehire laid-off city employees. In addition, as unemployment figures rose, CETA funds intended for training were shifted to activities providing immediate work. More and more, CETA became an income transfer mechanism. The short run attraction of putting people to work immediately caused some prime sponsors to ignore the long run benefits of investing in classroom training.

But prime sponsors have a responsibility to carefully consider the real and lasting labor market and human resource needs of their areas. In developing their plans, prime sponsors should ask themselves, "What are the advantages of classroom training, and how do I decide if it is the best training approach for potential clients in my area?" The remainder of this monograph is directed to those who discover positive answers to that question.

[2]Bernard E. Anderson, *The Opportunities Industrialization Centers: A Decade of Community-Based Manpower Services*, Manpower and Human Resources Studies, No. 6 (Philadelphia: Industrial Research Unit, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1976), p. 30.

[3]Ibid., pp. 31-33.

2. ADVANTAGES, DISADVANTAGES, AND PRECONSIDERATIONS FOR CLASSROOM TRAINING

Classroom training, in CETA terms, may be defined as the occupational skills training that results from the interaction between a group of students and teachers in a classroom setting other than a work site. Classroom trainng may be conducted in a conventional vocational-technical school, in a community college, or in a skills center designed specifically for training disadvantaged workers. It may be a multi-occupational type facility or a classroom oriented toward a single occupation. It may provide special supportive services to the trainees or refer them individually to a regular course for nondisadvantaged students. But classroom training differes from on-the-job training and work experience programs in that trainees are away from the job site during the classroom training period.

The Case for Classroom Training

Classroom training has several advantages, especially for those individuals who have not been receptive to more traditional educational approaches.

The Qualitative Aspects

As advocates, we are convinced that classroom training, when successfully completed, tends to produce more permanently trained individuals than do other kinds of training. This is evidenced in after-training wages and job retention. On-the-job training has the advantage of including placement, whereas classroom graduates still have to find a job. However, there is evidence that classroom training tends to produce individuals who are more likely to stay on a job after they have been placed, less likely to need retraining six months or a year after placement, and more likely to be promoted.

For example, the 1976 evaluation of CETA Title I programs in New York City showed that the classroom training placement rate (56 percent) was second only to on-the-job training (71 percent), and classroom training graduates earned the highest average post-CETA wage ($3.94 per hour). Evaluation of the New York OIC during the same period showed a job retention rate of 87 percent after ninety days on the job.

Properly done, classroom training can provide a setting and a framework wherein all the varous aspects of skills training, job preparation, and job readiness are considered. In those institutional settings where instruction in a variety of occupational skills is offered, enrollees may have a choice of occupations. Their career options are as open as they ideally are in the traditional educational system. Unlike on-the-job training or referral to a single occupation classroom setting, enrollees in multi-occupation classroom training facilities have an opportunity to choose and test possible occupations before having to make long-term commitments to a particular job.

During the classroom training process, trainees should learn the requirements and employer expectations in the particular occupational skills area they have chosen. They are introduced to occupational demands. They master not only the required skills but also the occupational role they will be expected to carry out. Classroom training allows trainees to build confidence within themselves and trust in their own abilities before having their skills proficiency tested in actual job performance. Such a psychological advantage pays dividends in employee performance, employer satisfaction, and job retention. Classroom training graduates go to their new jobs confident that they can do the work expected of them. And employers receive job-ready employees.

Classroom training participants not only acquire necessary occupational skills but also develop personal discipline and participation habits that carry over into the work setting. Those who have disciplined themselves to attend classes

regularly during the weeks or months of classroom training are less likely to be chronically absent from work.

In addition, classroom training participants should be well known by their teachers and their counselors. If so, classroom training provides the opportunity for a cooperative staff to thoroughly assess a trainee and to improve upon attitudes and behavior patterns prior to actual job placement. Classroom training participants receive skills training along with personal guidance and other necessary supportive services to enable their smooth transition to the world of work. In those programs that fulfill their true potential and responsibility, classroom training participants are viewed as whole persons, with both vocational and personal needs, and the classroom training setting becomes a laboratory for personal growth (of which skills acquisition is only a part).

Ideally, the classroom training structure can permit persons in charge of job placement to do a better placement job. The staff should know more about the graduates they are recommending to employers than do staff who place individuals as direct referrals (or enroll them in on-the-job training or work experience or hire them to fill public service employment slots). Thus, classroom training can provide the structure, the staff arrangement, and the instructional environment for the full probing and processing of potentialities. It is equally concerned with the actual needs of the potential employer and the potential employee. Classroom training is designed to produce a satisfied, proficient, and productive employee, which should result in pleased, persuaded, and contented employers.

As a Holding Pattern

Classroom training also has a hidden advantage during periods of abnormally high unemployment, especially with regard to serving the needs of disadvantaged youth. Almost one out of five of the nine million youth aged sixteen to nineteen in the labor force is unemployed, creating an unemployment rate triple that for adults. Unemployment among black youth is twice that of white youth, and official statistics do not reflect the situation of the most severely disadvantaged who have dropped out of both school and the labor market.

Classroom training recognizes the current reality that the society cannot support all of its potential labor force. Classroom training performs a societal function similar to that of the colleges and universities in the traditional education system, but it directs its services to a different population. Classroom training keeps unemployed and previously unemployable individuals out of the labor force longer than do other types of training. It also provides these individuals with a better entry point into the labor market at the end of the training period than they would have had without the benefit of the classroom training experience.

The abnormally high unemployment rate among youth between the ages of sixteen and nineteen probably results less from their work performance potential than it does from the competition with older, more experienced workers for existing jobs. When the competition for jobs is keen, employers are most likely to opt for maturity and experience in choosing their personnel. Thus, a CETA prime sponsor would be well advised to accept the fact that certain special groups of individuals will not be readily absorbed into the labor market. Acting on that fact, the sponsor can create classroom training opportunities for those individuals which will offer decent employment opportunities at the end of training. While performing a short-term function of removing persons from the labor market, classroom training also provides a long-term service that is not accomplished by other short-term crisis programs such as work experience and public service employment. Classroom training seeks to transfer individuals from the ranks of the unemployed and unemployable to the status of workers with income earning capability, rather than merely transferring payments to the currently jobless.

Program Independence

One further advantage of the classroom training approach merits mention. Even though classroom training programs should involve representatives of business and industry in every phase of program operation and design (such as gathering local labor market information, choosing those occupational skills that are in demand and will be in demand in the future, and designing a curriculum to teach skills proficiency in those chosen areas providing jobs for after-training placement), classroom training nevertheless maintains a more independent stance from business and industry than do other training approaches. On-the-job training, for example, is at the mercy of the whims and enthusiasm of business and industry. When business and industry feel pressure to participate, training flourishes. But the relaxation of pressure is usually accompanied by dwindling business and industrial participation in training efforts.

Pressure may take the form of a perceived moral and social obligation or a practical personnel need. When employers need workers, they are naturally more enthusiastic about participating in training programs to provide those workers. Or when the government actively pursues equal employment opportunity measures through organizations such as the National Alliance of Businessmen, business and industry will add on-the-job training as an appendage to their other activities, even if there is really no strong commitment to such training programs. But the participatory enthusiasm in business and industry fluctuates with economic and government pressures.

Of course, classroom training all too often falls short of its potential. Ideals are to be pursued and approached but rarely achieved.

The Disadvantages of Classroom Training

Even though classroom training is a more independent training approach and tends to produce greater long-term benefits, it is not always the best training mechanism for all occupations or every local labor market area.

Lack of Flexibility

Classroom training is the least flexible training approach. Classroom training programs require a costly investment in staff, equipment purchase, and classroom facilities. Such programs take a great deal of time to set up; and once established, they are costly to dismantle. Unlike on-the-job training, public service employment, or work experience, classroom training programs tend to acquire an institutional life of their own and are nearly as difficult to dismantle as colleges and universities. Thus, after an investment in classroom training has been made and the training process has been set in motion, it is much more difficult for a prime sponsor to shift over to a different approach than it would be with on-the-job training or work experience programs.

Information Requirements

The dominant concern of the prime sponsor who decides to invest in classroom training is that such training must be relevant. It must be relevant to the real needs of the local labor market area and to the real needs of the people enrolled. Such relevance requires a careful and complete compilation of labor market information, the involvement of representatives of business and industry in technical assistance and technical advisory capacities, and the consultation and advice during the planning process of those who are "in touch" with the target population to be served and who understand their true needs and aspirations.

It is simply not possible to garner the necessary information needed for knowing labor market needs and trends—and for designing classroom training programs based on that information—from monthly reports issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, state labor department job projections, or job bank listings from the employment service. A more comprehensive and innovative approach to gathering labor market information is needed. And as Donald Menzi has pointed out, CETA legislation allows prime sponsors to take the initiative in creating labor market analysis. CETA provides money to local prime sponsors for employment, training, and supportive services and for "other activities." Says Menzi: "This 'other activities' money makes it possible for the first time to create a market for local area labor market information and analysis. Now, because there are funds to pay for data and to buy the time for economists and researchers, local planners may begin to get some of the basic tools needed to do the job."[4]

To improve and make present labor market data systems more relevant to local prime sponsor planning needs, Menzi suggests the following changes, which could be accomplished at a relatively low cost (compared with other employment and training program outlays):

> The categories used in tabulating administrative data need to be re-examined to make sure that tables are as relevant as possible. The most obvious examples are geographical breakdowns, which should conform to governmental jurisdictions, not just to agencies' administrative districts. Data on the industry affiliation of UI beneficiaries should also be broken out as finely as are tables of employment covered by the Unemployment Insurance system. When this is done, it is possible to calculate insured unemployment rates on an industry-by-industry basis, which is helpful in keeping track of what is happening in diverse segments of local economies.
>
> Arrangements should be made for periodic special tabulations, such as the characteristics of low, medium and high wage UI beneficiaries. Annual industry-occupation-median wage tables of job orders placed in job banks can present a more detailed picture of local economies. Cross-tabulations of the personal characteristics of Employment Service placements by industry, by occupation, or by wage would tell us something about the way various categories of job-seekers fit into that picture.
>
> New sources of administrative data can also be developed. The tax withholding system could, for example, tell us something about labor turnover . . . Newly appearing social security numbers imply additions to the payroll; deletions imply terminations from employment. It appears, in other words, that these records could provide information on hiring and termination patterns roughly comparable to data on labor turnover rates, but without the limitations of sample-based data.[5]

Where Are the Jobs?

The greatest disadvantage of classroom training is its dependence upon the availability of a job immediately upon completion of the training program. For on-the-job training (OJT), the job is built in. The classroom trainee is better prepared, but that is no help if no job is available, and delay in placement will convince not only the trainee but others in the community that the program is a farce.

The key to comparing the advantages and disadvantages of classroom training with alternative methods of improving employability is to recognize the differences in objectives. Work experience is a holding pattern from which income and possibly some familiarity with work discipline are obtained. Public service employment generally provides a job to the job-ready when other opportunities are limited. OJT provides a regular job. But the jobs for those receiving OJT and classroom training are generally different, and the two training methods are rarely competitive. OJT is the customary way industry prepares people to do semiskilled

[4]Donald Menzi, "Local Labor Market Information for Manpower Program Planning," *County Manpower Report*, pt. one, vol. 3, No. 4, August 1974.

[5]Ibid., pt. two, vol. 3, No. 6, December 1974.

jobs. Thus the jobs can be filled at the entry level by the untrained, who then move up by small skill increments in an internal labor market. Classroom training is the almost universal approach to preparation for those jobs where an employer expects the employee to have the skills to do the job before obtaining it. To use classroom training to prepare for a job more customarily learned by OJT implies that either the enrollee has special disadvantages to be compensated for or classroom training is being misused.

Cautions to Program Designers

In planning classroom training programs designed to meet the real needs, aspirations, and expectations of enrollees, prime sponsors should seek the counsel of both community-based representatives and business and industrial leaders. Doing so lessens the risk that prime sponsor plans may be based upon unsupported assumptions. An unfortunate occupational trait of some program planners is making assumptions about both the individuals most in need of services and employer needs. But assumptions will not do where true assimilation of these individuals is required. The program designer must be fully aware of and sensitive to the cultural backgrounds and personal needs of the client groups and to the employer's first requirement to make a profit or to achieve the mission of the institution.

Industry Involvement

Some planners assume that disadvantaged minority people cannot enter into and work within the established business organizations and that business and industry are not really interested in hiring previously disadvantaged minority workers. Such assumptions limit the occupational opportunities of the most severely disadvantaged to the lowest level jobs, public service jobs, and other stop-gap employment measures.

In designing classroom training, prime sponsors need to create a "marriage" between business and industry and training. But marriages not based upon true dialogue and sharing in the decision-making process have a way of disintegrating. It is true in the husband and wife relationship, and it is also true in planning training. Leaders of business and industry can be true partners with those engaged in training only if they are in a position to influence training designs at the policy and decision-making levels. Leaders of business and industry largely determine the possibility of realizing the goals of training. As employers, they represent both the existing labor market and whatever changing labor market trends will determine the job market of the future. Classroom training that is not related to employer needs at every step of the training path is almost predestined to produce frustration and disappointment for trainees and is preordained to failure in meeting the real human resource and labor market needs of society.

Writing of the need to involve business and industry more closely in CETA prime sponsor activities, Larry M. Blair, Gary deMik, and John Doggette urged:

> Prime sponsors must work to include business and industry management as a resource used in the local manpower delivery system while at the same time demonstrating that CETA and the prime sponsor are important resources to be used by employers.
>
> To achieve viable business involvement in local manpower services programs, the manpower administrator must generate training activities that meet employers' hiring requirements. The manpower administrator must also work to expand the awareness of business and industrial management concerning how manpower services are delivered, how this affects private firms in terms of labor force quantity and quality, and why business participation is essential for developing and maintaining effective, locally-controlled manpower programs.[6]

The authors further urge "the development of an ad hoc business community advisory committee to the prime sponsor" (perhaps using the local office of the National Alliance of Businessmen or some similar group as an initial source of contact) which will "permit the interchange of ideas and information, and provide a base for obtaining a viable business representation on the manpower planning council." The functions of such an ad hoc advisory group would include: "Providing input of employers' reviews of manpower activities; presenting and reviewing changes that will improve the prime sponsor's relations with business; providing general review of manpower programs and the comprehensive manpower plan; making suggestions for new directions in manpower programs; providing contact with the total business and industry community; selecting the business representatives for the manpower planning councils."[7]

As mentioned earlier, a cardinal principle of the OIC training philosophy has been insistence upon a close working alliance between training activities and the employer community. To ensure such a relationship, the OIC national organization is connected with three groups of representatives from the business and industrial community. The National Industrial Advisory Council (NIAC) is comprised of top level executives from the nation's leading corporations. NIAC members participate in the formulation of OIC policies, review problem areas, assess program performance, and serve as advocates on behalf of OIC training within the private sector. The National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) is comprised of other high level executive staff of each member company in NIAC. NTAC members are able to maintain a closer continuous contact with the OIC program, and the committee is divided into subcommittees covering such areas as finance, government relations, public relations, fund raising, and management training. The Industry Technical Assistance Contact (ITAC) is an extension of the NIAC network into local communities which establishes

[6] Larry M. Blair, Gary deMik, and John Doggette, "Increasing Business and Industry Involvement in CETA Prime Sponsor Activities," *Adherent*, vol. 3, No. 3, December 1976, p. 54.

[7] Ibid., p. 49.

contact between industry representatives in local areas and local OIC executive directors. Through ITAC, technical assistance and advice is provided at the local level, in the hope of ensuring the relevance of OIC classroom training to local labor market needs.[8] Some local OIC's have their own Industrial Advisory Councils and Technical Assistance Committees.

The Nature of Disadvantagement

Not only must classroom training content and design serve the real needs, expectations, and aspirations of present and potential employers, but careful consideration must also be given to which occupational areas are best taught in the classroom training setting. Classroom training is not necessary for some occupational skill areas; nor is it always a practical method for teaching certain vocational skills. Prime sponsors must decide which individuals and what occupational skills areas are best suited to classroom training and which groups of individuals should receive training priority. The optimum goal for classroom training programs would be to enroll the most severely disadvantaged in skills training for occupational areas in greatest demand which also provide maximum wages and opportunities for advancement. But that optimum goal must be tempered by other considerations. The term "disadvantaged," while calling attention to the needs of those most abandoned by society's institutions and most gripped by hopelessness and despair, is nevertheless both nebulous and deceptive as a description of those persons who should be among the primary target groups for classroom training. The term "disadvantaged" is frequently viewed as a synonym for "hardcore unemployed."

Again, Donald W. Menzi has called attention to the "myth of the 'hardcore' unemployed" as describing the "true constituency of manpower training efforts." Menzi illustrates the "myth" by citing an example from the neighborhood in which he lives. In his neighborhood, there is a mall in the middle of the street where the park benches are frequently occupied by persons who appear to be addicted to alcohol or drugs. Across the street, there is a large fast-food restaurant where young blacks work behind the counter at minimum-wage, dead-end jobs. And across the street from the restaurant is a large bank where many black youth are also working behind the counter in a work environment that encourages learning new skills and offers possibilities for advancing up the career ladder. Menzi continues:

> The reality of manpower training is illustrated in the gap between the lunch counter and the bank counter. The gap between the park bench and the bank teller's cage is a much greater margin, requiring very specialized manpower training efforts. There is a great need for such specialized programs. But the perpetuation of the myth that manpower training is *primarily* designed to rehabilitate the 'hardcore' unemployed and make them into bank tellers is, I believe, damaging to manpower training efforts in general. The myth is not true, and a credibility gap is created.[9]

[8] Anderson, op. cit., pp. 80-85.

[9] Donald Menzi, "Manpower Planning: Myths and Realities," *Adherent*, vol. 2, No. 2, August 1975, p. 49.

Thus, there are levels of disadvantagement that must be considered in establishing target groups for classroom training efforts. Prime sponsors must recognize and admit that classroom training programs cannot and will not serve everyone who falls within the "disadvantaged" category. Those who have alcohol or drug abuse problems, or who are in methdone maintenance therapy—even though they are among the "hardcore" unemployed—will not be readily accommodated or adequately served by regular classroom training programs. Their needs are special, requiring a very specialized set of supportive services, and their training should be conducted by agencies that have adopted such a specialized role and whose staff members reflect such specialized expertise

But at the same time, caution must be exercised so that rules and guidelines do not encourage or build in exclusion. Accountability and evaluation requirements must not exclude those among the disadvantaged who could be served by regular classroom training programs but whose degree of disadvantagement might require a longer period of training. While accountability and evaluation are necessary in determining which classroom training programs are using their funding allocations effectively to meet their stated goals in the established training time frames, such accountability can be a two-edged sword. It is a blessing to an agency really doing its job, a means of documenting training success, but it is at the same time a temptation to build in assured success mechanisms. The necessity of obtaining funds can be a temptation toward selectivity; that is, "creaming" applications so that only those who have a high probability of successful completion are accepted into the classroom training program. If a classroom training program is required to place 75 percent of its enrollees on jobs and further required to show a 75 percent job retention rate, the initial enrollment procedure is likely to reflect a conscious awareness that the program can afford only a 25 percent margin of error.

Within the wider category of the unemployed, prime sponsors should seek to identify specific target groups of disadvantaged persons who would benefit from classroom training, particularly those who are unemployed or underemployed (even though employed full or part time) because they lack marketable skills. During times of unusually high unemployment, the ranks of the unemployed will even include numbers of young people who are college graduates. They need jobs rather than more classroom training. Their major problem is a depressed job market rather than a lifelong depression of opportunity.

Specific target groups for classroom training efforts would include youth and young adults (particularly high school dropouts or pushouts), persons over the age of 45, welfare recipients and members of welfare families, persons with limited English-speaking ability, veterans, handicapped persons, ex-offenders, ex-addicts, and unemployed heads of households. The "hardest core" of the unemployed may not be represented in such target groups, but they certainly represent special needs within the larger category of the vocationally disadvantaged. Classroom training efforts should be judged and evaluated (and funded or refunded) on

the grounds of how well they have served the needs of the particular target groups identified, rather than by the impact classroom training has had upon the total economic climate and labor market picture of a particular community. Such total impact is beyond the scope and control of classroom training or any other employment and training effort. Fluctuations in the economy and the labor market are caused by forces beyond the control of classroom training, and manpower resources are never sufficient to be the dominant deciding factor in economic change.

For Which Occupational Skills?

In deciding which occupational skills should be taught in a classroom setting, program planners must consider three factors—training and equipment costs, space for training, and the real requirements for occupational expertise. Some jobs obviously do not require any formal training at all and are consequently at the lowest rungs of the occupational ladder. For example, a messenger, an elevator operator, an assembly line worker, or a person performing any one of a number of "button-pushing" jobs does not need classroom training (or any kind of structured training) to successfully do the job. Other jobs require learning and promotion on the job and are accessible only by starting at the bottom.

Classroom training is suited to those occupational skill areas where proficiency requires the mastery of cognitive skills rather than (or in combination with) purely mechanical skills. If 50 percent or more of training for a particular occupation requires mastering cognitive skills, the classroom setting is appropriate. An auto mechanic, an electrician, or a bricklayer must first understand basic theory in his or her occupational skills area before mastering additional mechanical skills. On the other hand, workers who push buttons or assemble parts and are not required to understand the functioning intricacies of the machines they are operating have no need for classroom training.

The cost of training equipment and the space required to accommodate it are further considerations in deciding which occupational areas can best be taught in a classroom setting. The cost and maintenance of equipment solely for training purposes is very expensive and often a prohibitive cost factor, even if such equipment could be easily accommodated in a classroom setting. And some equipment is too bulky and cumbersome, even if the expense of purchase and maintenance could be managed. For example, crane operators, truck drivers, or ferry boat operators are not likely to learn their trades in the classroom. They need on-the-road, water, or construction site training.

But less bulky equipment often is still too expensive to be used exclusively for classroom training. Computer training is a prime example. Most planners of classroom training programs would find the cost prohibitive if they considered purchasing the necessary equipment for teaching computer skills. A thorough and intensive computer training program requires a computer at the complete disposal of classroom trainees. That's a prohibitive cost factor. But a classroom training program in computer skills can be created by effecting a working "marriage" between a classroom training program and a computer manufacturer such as IBM. The company can afford the cost of the equipment but would find the personnel costs prohibitive if it set up its own computer training program for the disadvantaged. A cost effective arrangement comes into being when the classroom training program picks up the staff and training costs while the company provides the necessary equipment. As a result, both "marriage partners" are happy. The classroom training program is able to provide valuable skills training to its disadvantaged clientele, and the company has a reliable future source of adequately trained potential new employees.

The Qualifications of Instructors

Two further preconsiderations to setting up effective classroom training programs deserve mention—the selection and training of teachers, administrators, and managers for the programs and the payment of stipends to the enrollees.

Teachers whose training and experience have been grounded in other educational institutions and settings may need retraining and reorientation in order to serve effectively in classroom training programs. Such retraining and reorientation may involve learning a new education philosophy, new teaching methodologies, new attitudes toward students, and new communication skills. Classroom training instruction must always be geared to occupational application, with the intent of producing employable graduates possessing marketable skills and with the knowledge that skills must be upgraded in accord with changing labor market demands. Rather than encouraging students to pursue high grades, classroom training pursues individual students, encouraging them to make the grade in the world of work.

Thus, teachers who are new to the classroom training setting often must learn to speak a new language. They must direct their teaching communication to the specific and unique needs of each student, recognizing that the success of their work as teachers is marked by the successful placement of each student in the world of work.

Potential administrators and managers of classroom training programs are also often ill prepared by prior experience to fulfill their special responsibilities. They must be trained and equipped to meet the hard demands of cost effectiveness and training accountability. They must learn to live with the pressures and meet the demands of specific numbers of students trained and placed on jobs in specific time frames, and they must also learn to reconcile themselves to the reality that they cannot breathe a sigh of relief when training and placement are completed. The retention rate of classroom training graduates is the final measure of the success or failure of a program.

Stipends: To Pay or Not To Pay?

Directly related to a reorientation concerning how teachers teach disadvantaged students and how managers administer classroom training programs is a change in attitude as to how those students are motivated to learn. Current policy appears to be based on the following assumption: If disadvantaged persons are going to be trained for some kind of employment, they must be paid stipends for receiving that training. Since money talks in our society, the presupposition is that immediate dollars in the pocket will provide the best of all possible incentives for training. Such an assumption presupposes either a generally low level of motivation and self-esteem or a universal need for immediate income.

Prior to the CETA legislation, OIC had a policy of not paying stipends to classroom training enrollees. Stipend incentives were viewed as antithetical to OIC's self-help and motivational emphasis. The refusal to pay stipends clearly differentiated OIC training from government operated programs. Under CETA, all program service delivery agents must accept participants who receive stipends, unless the prime sponsor waives that requirement for some stipend categories. Welfare recipients, for example, are not subject to waiver.

Stipend allowances represent only a whisper in our money talking society, but they still present a problem for classroom training. Stipend allowances are paid at the rate of $2.10 an hour for up to thirty-five hours of training per week. (Trainees with more than two dependents also receive $5 a week for each additional dependent up to four, or a maximum of $20 for six or more dependents.) Welfare recipients, regardless of welfare category, are paid an "incentive" allowance of $30 per week. Classroom training enrollees who draw unemployment insurance (UI) benefits receive stipends that, when added to the UI benefits, equal the maximum CETA stipend allowance. Veterans receive both veterans benefits and CETA allowances, regardless of the total.

Even though stipend payments are not a "get rich quick" scheme for classroom training enrollees, stipends can work to the detriment of motivational goals. The motivational goals of classroom training are to inspire each student to acquire an employable skill and to be eager to put that skill to use in the world of work. In most instances, students will begin in entry level jobs in their particular occupational area in the hope that promotion and advancement opportunities will follow in due time. Adding training stipends to other benefits received by some classroom training students creates a situation in which those students will have to take a cut in pay to accept an entry level job at the end of the training period. Such a financial sacrifice is hardly an "incentive." Willingness to accept a pay cut after training is usually found only among those who choose religious or social service careers. But classroom training students have not taken a vow of poverty. They have experienced the devastating cycle of poverty, and the decision to enter classroom training represents a personal vow to get out.

Strategic support for individual students would be more in tune with the OIC motivational concerns than would blanket stipend payments. The special needs of students could be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and financial support could be designed to enable a student to complete training. Stipend payments should never be so high that completing training and being placed on a job will be a financial let down. Strategic stipend support represents the same kind of reorientation required of teachers in the classroom; namely, looking at the personal, individual needs of each student and responding to those needs. However, that option is not available to prime sponsors for most population groups in training.

3. INGREDIENTS OF CLASSROOM TRAINING

The recipe for successful classroom training contains the following ingredients: Client-centered, individualized instruction; employment-related personal counseling; team training and assessment; and internal accountability and feedback. When those ingredients are mixed thoroughly, and sprinkled with a liberal dose of true commitment, the result is a classroom training program "that's really cookin'!"

Client-Centered Instruction

Training techniques and concepts, curriculum materials, classroom procedures, and built-in structures for accountability are all important and contribute to the successful training process. But all are subordinate to the attitude, the commitment, the motivation, and the sense of purpose of trainers and the agencies in which skills training takes place. The OIC experience suggests that, if there is a substantial *qualitative* difference in training at various agencies throughout the country, it is less likely to be measured by the usual statistical modes of evaluation than it is to be found in the personal, day-by-day operational experience of trainers themselves.

What It Is

The quality of training can be expected to be *reflected* in statistical results but not *measured* by them. The commitment, motivation, determination, and zeal of trainers will undoubtedly produce superior results in such statistically measurable areas as cost per trainee, number of persons trained in a given time period, successful job placement, and retention rates. But those statistics are no more a true measure of quality than are membership rolls a measure of the social value and service of a church, fraternal organization, or civic group.

Individualized, client-centered instruction is at the core of any successful classroom training program. Although specific training techniques and methodologies are employed in the process, the important ingredients are attitudinal and motivational. Individualization embraces both "personalizing" and "humanizing" the training process. Client-centered instruction means simply that the client—the trainee—is indeed at the center of the training process and that all administrative, managerial, structural, and methodological decisions stem from that recognized focal point.

What makes individualized instruction truly personal is an attitude of respect and concern on the part of trainers — a genuine respect for the rights and feelings of trainees, accompanied by compassionate concern for their problems and needs as individuals. Training that remains dispassionately aloof from home, family, financial, and other environmental pressures experienced by trainees (which indeed may be overwhelming barriers to the learning process) cannot correctly be called "personalized" instruction. The labels "individualized," "personalized," or "one-to-one" training may be technically correct. But apart from an attitude of true concern, such labels merely identify a process rather than mold and bring out a trainee's true potential and personal identity.

The Trainer's Attitude

Openness and caring are the marks of client-centered training. An openness requires both the ability and the willingness to *listen*. A trainer who is a willing listener is one who not only hears a trainee's problem but also is willing and committed to helping solve (or at least alleviate) that problem. The trainer should seek to remove external barriers to the learning process. Thus, the self-interests of both the trainer and the trainee are served. The trainer can do his or her job; the trainee is freed to receive that training.

Openness and caring further require adopting a nonjudgmental attitude. Trainers in community-based employment and training agencies are dealing with clients who have received negative societal judgments all their lives. Those directing their prior educational experiences have abandoned them with the judgment that they are slow, uncooperative,

incorrigible, or incompetent. The welfare bureaucracy sees them in terms of statistics on persons who make no contribution to social productivity. Some have been so buffeted by negative judgment, rejection, and abandonment that they have run afoul of the law, ending up behind prison bars or on probation or parole.

Trainers should view those negative factors in a trainee's life as experiences rather than faults. Trainers must seek to establish and communicate a training environment where a trainee's past life experiences are neither perceived as faults nor judged negatively. Honest and sincere client-centered training can take place only in such an environment.

Although the trainer and the training environment must be accepting and nonjudgmental, such openness must not be marked by permissiveness and a lack of discipline or definite standards of expectations. Classroom training staff should be "buffers" rather than "crutches." The classroom training environment should be a support system, not a playground or a carousel for those individuals who specialize in the revolving door practice of "in one program and out the other." A truly supportive role requires both encouragement and admonition, when appropriate. Growth, discipline, and achievement are interrelated. For example, trainers who care about trainees cannot simply tolerate or overlook absenteeism. They will be obsessed with determining the cause of a trainee's absence and will seek to correct the fault, whether the blame falls upon the trainer, the trainee, or social and environmental pressures.

The Language Problem

Thus, individualized client-centered training that is also personalized requires a determined effort on the part of trainers to see that trainees hear according to their own language. A sympathetic understanding and empathy with the life experiences of trainees, with their experiential and existential world view, is absolutely essential to determining the appropriate language for instruction.

The most obvious example, of course, is instruction in English as a second language. The client-centered trainer will begin with the familiar language, the native tongue, teaching the trainee what he or she needs to know in that language. After those communication skills necessary for coping and being successful are mastered in the familiar tongue, they can then be translated into the less familiar second language. Such training will enable prospective employers or job interviewers to hear trainees speaking in the native tongue of the world of employment.

But the same principle also applies where training in communication skills does not involve a "second" or "foreign" language. The jargon of the ghetto is a "foreign" tongue to many prospective employers. Trainers who are committed to teaching commmunication skills (rather than merely offering instruction in grammar, sentence structure, and so-called "proper" English) will begin with the familiar and move on to the new. For example, a communication skills class might use poetry as a teaching method. Trainees would be encouraged to write their own poems, using colloquial language and familiar experiences. The work produced by trainees would then be used as a base for exploring and understanding the work of other poets, such as Langston Hughes and William Shakespeare. By beginning with the familiar tongue and the perhaps all-to-familiar and painful personal experiences, the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" become comprehensible!

Team Teaching and Assessment

Team teaching is also a mark of the successful classroom training program. Teachers, counselors, and job placement specialists work in unison on their common client-centered goal. Honest listening to the needs, apprehensions, and aspirations of trainees — combined with a clear training goal — enables the client-centered team to work together for the general welfare and total development of the individual trainee. Team training means that neither the training experiences of trainees nor the structures and methodologies of the agency are schizophrenic. Each service provided to an individual trainee is part of an integrated whole; the interrelated training services combine to fulfill the classroom training goal.

In a classroom training program where the team-training spirit is truly and operationally dominant, the concept of "team" soon takes on more of the qualities of "family." It is a common experience in any family for all of the energies and attentions of family members to be directed toward a newborn baby. The family gears itself to meet and serve the needs of the newest arrival.

In like manner, in a classroom training program where the team spirit prevails, all staff members recognize the priority of meeting the needs of trainees. Program structures and administrative decisions are based upon the recognition that the program exists for the sole purpose of nurturing and training trainees and placing them on jobs. Trainers and trainees realize their interdependence. Team members listen in a truly client-centered way because they realize that it is because of the trainees that they have a job.

The Role of the Counselor

The role of the counselor in classroom training programs deserves special mention. The counselor's role has long been ambiguous and ill-defined. In their evaluation of the skills center program under MDTA, Garth Mangum and John Walsh pinpointed the counseling ambiguity.[10] Although skills center counselors universally recognized their role as enrollee advocates, their disciplinary function was an issue of rather

[10] Mangum and Walsh, op. cit., pp. 68-71.

intense debate. Those who argued against the role of counselors as disciplinarians insisted that an enrollee was not likely to seek advice and unburden his or her personal problems to a "truant officer" who had previously cost the enrollee a day's pay for being absent.

The role and purpose of counselors remain ambiguous in too many classroom training programs and must be clearly defined. As with all other personnel in the classroom training program, counselors must see their primary purpose as that of enabling a trainee to function on a job in the world of work. The primary focus of counseling must be vocational rather than therapeutic. Classroom training counselors must recognize that their responsiblity is to get a person into a job.

Much of the confusion in the counseling role can be clarified by dropping the title "counselor" and substituting "employment advisor." When counselor/employment advisors see successful job placement as their ultimate goal, they will realize that no individual malady is terminal. They will recognize the personal problems of trainees as barriers to successful entry into the world of work and deal with those problems in that context. Rather than tampering with a trainee's psyche, counselor/employment advisors will seek to "psych up the trainee" for the world of work.

Accountability and Feedback

A classroom training program that exists solely to serve trainees will organize itself according to the needs of its clientele rather than insisting that trainees adjust their schedules and their lives to meet agency requirements. For example, the open entry, open exit training structure is a structural witness to client-centered training. Trainees must be able to enter training at the closest possible proximity to that moment when they decide they want to be trained. And that spontaneity and sense of immediacy must be retained throughout the training process. Whenever and at the precise moment that a trainee is ready, he or she must be able to move directly into the world of employment. For the clientele served by community-based classroom training programs, training is crisis training. As in political crises, a sense of urgency is present and should permeate the training process.

Classroom training that is truly client-centered in structure and in purpose will recognize the necessity of both accountability and feedback. Two kinds of accountability are required of classroom training staff — internal and external. External accountability is that which is reported to public funding sources. Such accountability gives statistical evidence that the contractual requirements have been fulfilled — number of persons trained and placed on jobs, retention rates, cost per trainee, and so on.

On the other hand, internal accountability and feedback are family matters. They are the means by which a classroom training program tests its goal against its actual service. Internal accountability and feedback seek to measure the fulfillment of the contractual obligation a classroom training program has with its students. Internal accountability and feedback are the means used to check the program's promissory notes to trainees.

Internal feedback is rather simple. If you want to know whether or not the real needs of trainees are being met, ask the trainees themselves. If the right training environment has been established, and if trust, openness, and reciprocity have been achieved, trainees will feel free and willing to give honest answers. In like manner, the best way to find out about trainee performance on the job — to test the success of training as actual job preparation — is to ask employers.

Internal accountability is also a team function. Measuring the job readiness and employability of a trainee (both psychological and vocational) requires a "team tracking" effort on the part of each team member. Such shared accountability strengthens the function of the team, if the client-centered focus is maintained. That is, a team member cannot blame a client's unreadiness upon the failure of a colleague to do his or her job. Internal bickering and "buck-passing" are in reality breaches of contract with the individual trainee. The classroom training program and its staff exist to perform a training function. Trainee failures are to be seen as program failures, and the training team must re-group its energies and efforts to eliminate the cause of failure.

Esprit de Corps

As mentioned earlier, the classroom training spirit is at least as important as the techniques, methodologies, and structures used. It is very difficult to structure motivation or construct a flow chart for inspiration. Whatever term is chosen to describe a spirit-filled classroom training process, be it "behavior modification," "self-actualization," or whatever, we're really talking about a process of conversion. We're talking about people changing. When the spirit is present in a classroom training program, trainers are gripped by it and their jobs become more than occupations. They come to work when they might be tempted to call in sick. They stay late and can't wait to get to work the next morning.

The spirit is infectious. Trainees catch it from their trainers and the training environment. They find themselves, perhaps for the first time, in the presence of people who really care, who really understand. Fears and frustrations melt away. Old habits are replaced by new self-images. The classroom training conversion occurs when the recognition is internalized: "I am somebody! Now let me concentrate on becoming the person I want to be." The structure developed by OIC for dealing with this motivational aspect of classroom training is called the Feeder Program. It precedes vocational skills instruction in the OIC model, and it can embody the spirit-filled classroom *if* empathy and commitment of staff are

present. Leon H. Sullivan, OIC founder and national chairman of OIC's of America, has described the Feeder Program as follows:

> Included as a critical part of all OIC training is the special preparation called the *Feeder Program*. Each person who enters the OIC training program is required to enroll first in this attitudinal motivational program. This prevocational training provides the foundation necessary for many trainees to (1) accept the idea of going to school, (2) understand basic communicative and computational skills, and (3) be motivated to a point where a more than reasonable certainty can be established that he will remain on a job once trained and placed . . . After this prevocational training, the trainees are "fed" into the vocational training courses of their selection. From this action comes the "Feeder Program" name.[11]

Although the OIC Feeder Program concept has been appropriated by many other agencies, it is seldom implemented in the totality of its thrust toward serving the whole individual. The feeder concept is more than remedial education, although remediation is part of it. Communication and computational skills are taught — emphasizing the terminology and mathematics used in specific occupational areas — along with such specialized training courses as General Educational Development, Adult Basic Education, civil service preparation, and English as a second language. In addition, feeder instruction includes such subjects as minority history, good grooming and health habits, consumer education, and methods of job search.

A total feeder program is designed to bring about personal renewal. Remedial instruction is combined with exhortation concerning the self-worth, value, and dignity of each individual. Instruction in ethnic history, for example, is one way of instilling personal and cultural pride. When the feeder program is successful, it not only "feeds" trainees into vocational instruction but also "feeds" reborn individuals back into society — people with new skills, new self-images, and new outlooks on life.

[11]Leon H. Sullivan, *Alternatives to Despair* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1972), p. 23.

Interagency Linkages

A final ingredient of classroom training is the recognition by program operators that they cannot do the complete job independently and alone. Classroom training is only one part of serving the needs of the whole person. Classroom training programs should be linked to other agencies, institutions, and supportive services. They can benefit greatly from linkages to community colleges, to placement services, to on-the-job training programs, or to agencies designed to serve persons with special problems, needs, or handicaps.

But when such linkages are formed, the client-centered concept must always continue to prevail. No matter how many different agencies provide services for a particular trainee, there must always be clear lines delineating the ultimate responsibility for the individual client. The client must never get lost in a shuffle between agencies. When that happens, linkage becomes leakage and the client goes down the drain.

The sole purpose of any linkage between classroom training programs and other agencies or institutions is to better serve the needs of the individual client. Linkages are formed to meet client needs rather than program or institutional or managerial needs. Too often the reverse is true. Some program administrators seek linkages with other institutions, agencies, and services to make their own jobs easier or their program statistics look better, rather than as a further answer to the all-important question (which is the sole rationale for any linkage): "How can I better serve the real needs of this individual client?"

4. A PROFILE OF CLASSROOM TRAINING

Having identified the methodological ingredients and emphasized the spirit that must infuse methodology and inspire those who apply techniques, let us now attempt a thumbnail sketch of classroom training. A clear understanding of those structures and practicalities that contribute to successful classroom training is important. The bone and marrow of the successful classroom training program are the training environment and the program structure.

The Training Environment

The training classroom must always be consciously work-related and job-oriented. The vocational skills classroom is a work station where learning takes place. Every aspect of the classroom must be directly related to the actual work setting trainees will enter after their training is completed. In other words, the classroom is a simulated on-the-job training setting where real job duties are performed. The training institution is the "employer," and the instructors are "work supervisors."

For example, in a secretarial skills classroom, trainees would occupy their own desks, with telephones and typewriters, just as they will after they are employed as secretaries in a real office setting. In the classroom, the teacher would be the supervisor of the "secretarial pool," and students would perform assignments that are also real job duties required by the "employing" agency (typing memos, preparing correspondence, taking dictation, and so on). An automotive skills classroom would be a simulated garage, and the instructor would be the shop supervisor. Trainees would learn their skills while actually working on cars brought in by agency staff members and others. The food services classroom would be the cafeteria or dining room where agency staff members and other trainees are served.

In every occupational skills training area, the classroom must emphasize realism and relevance. The classroom/work station must provide real occupational experience before a trainee is held accountable for his or her skill performance by an employer in an actual work setting.

Instructors and Job Relatedness

Just as the classroom must simulate a real work setting, those who are best qualified to provide relevant instruction in real job requirements are persons who have had practical experience in the particular occupational skills area. Practitioners of a particular occupation are better qualified to provide vocational skills instruction than are persons who have only academic acquaintance with the subject.

When program operators are recruiting instructors for classroom training programs, they should canvass unions, shops, contractors, and recently retired or laid-off persons for qualified personnel. Such experienced practitioners will need training in teaching methodologies and techniques; thus, it is very important for classroom training programs to have active, ongoing staff training components. Also, classroom training instructors should pursue the necessary requirements for certification to ensure a consistency, a continuity, and a standard of quality in classroom training programs. But certification should not be a pre-employment requirement for potential teaching personnel. Such a requirement might exclude many persons with practical knowledge and experience who might later prove to be excellent instructors.

Job relatedness must also be emphasized from the very beginning of prevocational skills training. Trainees must receive a thorough briefing covering the full range of the various vocational skills areas offered by the classroom training program. The briefing should include a description of the job, salary, and promotional opportunities, a clear assessment of the necessary qualifications and employer expectations for such occupation, and an assessment of the long-term potential of a particular occupation in the future labor market. Such a briefing enables a trainee to make a reasonable personal occupational choice. A trainee then

begins the prevocational (or feeder) instruction in the necessary remedial and motivational areas with a clear occupational goal in mind.

Open Entry/Open Exit

Classroom training should be structured on the principle of open entry/open exit. Open entry simply means that trainees are able to enter training when they come to the classroom training program and do not have to wait until the end of a cycle or a semester before they can enroll. Open exit means that trainees will leave the classroom and enter the world of work when they have reached the desired level of employability.

The open entry/open exit structure implies other structural arrangements and training techniques. If trainees are entering and leaving the classroom training program according to a timetable tailored to fit their individual needs and employment goals, instruction and curriculum must be highly individualized. Curriculum should be trainee centered rather than group oriented, and the student rather than the instructor should be the focal point of all classroom activity.

During the intake process, when a potential trainee comes to the classroom training program, the individual's basic employment goal should be identified and measured against the program's capabilities for guiding the individual toward fulfillment of that goal. After the intake interview, an individual may be accepted into classroom training, transferred to some other form of job development or direct job placement, or referred to another agency whose services might be more appropriate for a particular individual than those offered by the classroom training program.

A specific employability plan should be developed for each trainee who does enter the classroom training program. The employability plan should establish specific confidence levels, which will be checked off as the individual student moves along the training path toward goal attainment.

All staff members involved in the training and job placement process should center their activities on the individual student's employability plan. Classroom instructors will be "managers" of the employability plan, guiding each trainee toward fulfillment of his or her specific employment goal. Employment advisors will be at work identifying jobs that fit each employability plan so that there will be employment for a trainee at the end of training. Such job identification should begin as soon as the trainee enters the program so that a trainee can move *directly* into the world of work after training is completed.

The cluster concept is a key ingredient in the open exit structure. It simply means that a cluster of skills and skill levels is offered in a particular occupational training course. Trainees in such cluster courses have a choice of completing a full range of skills in a particular occupational area or moving directly into employment after receiving training in only one skill level.

For example, an automotive services training course might offer a full cluster of skills such as brake specialist, carburetor mechanic, transmission mechanic, front-end specialist, and body repair. A trainee who chose to complete the full range of training would emerge as a fully qualified auto mechanic and body specialist. But a trainee would also have the option of choosing to exit from training as a qualified front-end technician or tune-up mechanic and moving directly into a job utilizing that particular skill.

Thus, the open entry/open exit structure seeks to move a trainee from employment, underemployment, or unemployability into the world of work within the time frame and at the level of expertise that suits the felt needs of each individual trainee. The open entry/open exit concept views an occupational skill area as a ladder. There are a number of rungs on the ladder—different levels of occupational qualification and expertise—just as there is a place in the labor market for each skill level. Trainees who are pressured by personal circumstance to start earning a wage as soon as possible should not be required to climb to the top of the ladder before getting a job.

Individualized Instruction

In the client-centered, open entry/open exit classroom, individualized instruction is perhaps a misnomer for the instructional method that places the student rather than the teacher at the classroom center. The process might better be described as individualized learning. The instructor is not only manager of the individual student's employability plan but also a manager of learning (rather than a disseminator of information).

Individualized instruction begins by determining what skills a student brings with him or her into the classroom, either by standardized testing or a basic skills test developed by the instructor. These skills are matched against those skills that the student must take out of the classroom to fulfill the employment goal at the end of training.

The course outline and lesson plans are translated into a series of necessary skills. The larger skill area should be broken down into subdivisions, or modules, which a student can master in a given period in the classroom. As individual modules are mastered, they combine to form a cluster of skills within the broader skill area. For example, if mathematics were the larger skill area of the classroom training course, addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division would each be a module within the cluster of learning to manipulate whole numbers. Of course, mastery of that cluster would be only part of total proficiency in mathematics. Fractions would also be broken down into modules and clusters, as would all other necessary mathematical skills.

Each module will be presented to the individual student in terms of clear behavioral objectives. The student will know in specific terms what mastery of a given module entails (e.g., completing a certain number of whole number addition problems in a given time period or less and getting a specified

number of the problems correct). Subdividing skills area curriculums into modules and clusters allows students to learn at their own pace and level of competency. Advanced students will skip modules that cover skills in which they have shown a proficiency in initial testing. Slow learners will be able to work on mastery of modules without feeling a pressure to keep up with the rest of the class or without holding the rest of the students at a learning standstill. In the open entry structure, the individualized modular approach permits students to begin immediately at their own level of individual learning need. And it also is an instruction method that permits other students in the classroom to share in the teaching process. Students who have mastered certain modules can assist slower learners or new students.

5. PATTERNS FOR CLASSROOM TRAINING

To paraphrase body-building or weight-loss program advertisements, classroom training can take place before, during, or after employment. The capacities of trainees, the needs of employers, and the demands of particular occupations combine to determine which classroom training pattern is appropriate for which trainees aspiring to what occupations.

Pre-Employment Classroom Training

The most basic classroom training pattern is that which provides all pre-employment instruction and experience entirely in the classroom setting. Enrollees are first tested, both with regard to aptitude and to determine what remedial instruction is necessary before they can move into vocational skills training. During the remedial and vocational skills training period, trainees are assisted by counselor/employment advisors in developing those work readiness attitudes and disciplines that must necessarily accompany vocational skills for a training graduate to be truly prepared for the world of work.

In some classroom training programs, all aspects of the training process (testing, counseling, remedial and vocational skills instruction, and job placement) are handled under one roof; in other programs, different services are parceled out among agencies. But whether the comprehensive single project or the multi-agency approach is used, the classroom training pattern is the same. Trainees receive instruction and work readiness preparation, they apply their newly acquired skills, and they develop self-confidence in their own expertise before having their performance tested in the actual job situation.

This pattern of classroom training allows trainees to spin off into full-time employment or into other kinds of training approaches. For example, some OIC trainees spin off into on-the-job training programs after they have completed their training in the Feeder Program. The motivational, attitudinal, and remedial instruction received during the Feeder Program is sufficient to enable students to receive on-the-job training in some occupations.

Sometimes on-the-job training is built into the complete classroom training cycle, with the assurance that students will be permanently employed at the end of the full training cycle. For example, a twenty week training cycle will include twelve weeks of classroom training and eight weeks of on-the-job training. During the on-the-job training phase, students are subsidized for half of the salary paid by the employer, and they become full-time, unsubsidized employees after the full cycle is completed.

Pre-employment classroom training is particularly suited for those trainees who are most in need of remedial instruction, who lack confidence and experience and are unfamiliar with the world of work, and who are most in need of self-assurance before being tested in job performance. Pre-employment classroom training is also advisable for those occupational areas where making mistakes on the job would prove costly and harmful. In such occupations, employers cannot afford to have on-the-job trainees, but rather require trained, tried, and tested personnel.

Classroom/Work Experience Training

In some occupational areas, classroom training can be successfully combined with work experience to the mutual benefit of employers and trainees. Under such an arrangement, trainees are subsidized for a thirty-five hour work and training week. Thirty hours are spent under close on-the-job supervision, and five hours are spent in the classroom. Thus, trainees have the experience of immediately applying their newly acquired skills during their working hours, while honing those skills in the classroom and developing the necessary proficiency for unsubsidized employment.

The classroom training and work experience combination is particularly beneficial where extra hands and bodies are needed by institutions participating in the work experience phase of the training experience and where learning by doing is of equal value to the cognititive skills learned in the classroom. But as with on-the-job training, the combination is not suited to those occupational areas where the mistakes of a novice would be costly, harmful, or otherwise detrimental.

Post-Employment Training

The classroom training experience provides only an introduction to the world of work. Most classroom training prepares trainees only for entry level jobs. Even though this function is vitally necessary (especially for the most severely disadvantaged students), it is at the same time one of the shortcomings of vocational skills training. Further training or skills acquisition is required if employees are to receive promotions into higher paying jobs and advance up the career ladder. Some employers include on-going training as part of the company policy and practice, but many employees must seek such training on their own.

The classroom training function and responsibility do not end with the successful placement of initial classroom training graduates. The initial classroom training experience introduces trainees to the world of work, and it also instills the recognition that employability requires having marketable skills. Those who have learned that lesson should also realize that promotion up the career ladder requires the acquisition of new skills. In addition, in our highly technological society, old skills are often threatened by obsolescence. To keep pace with rapid change in the job requirements of some occupational areas, former classroom training graduates must return to the classroom to upgrade their skills.

Thus, post-employment classroom training is a continuing education program to bring old skills up to date and to teach higher level proficiency. Such training is usually conducted in evening classes so that trainees can continue to work while they are upgrading their skills. Post-employment classroom training is not a luxury item tacked onto other classroom training patterns but rather the fulfillment of the initial commitment. Apart from post-employment classroom training, the initial training experience will simply be a process of moving the disadvantaged from the lowest stratum of society to the lowest rungs of the occupational and career ladders.

Evaluation of Classroom Training

The final phase of classroom training is evaluation—the ultimate yardstick by which the inch-by-inch daily classroom training efforts are finally measured. Evaluation is an indispensable tool for prime sponsors and planning councils as well as for program operators. It tells whether or not classroom training programs have traveled the desired distance, have measured up to expectations, are doing the best possible training job with the available resources, and have contributed substantially (or at least significantly) to the employment opportunities and vocational growth of trainees.

Evaluation Levels

Under CETA, there are three essential and legislatively mandated levels of evaluation—the federal, the prime sponsor, and the program operation levels.[12] At the federal level, the Secretary of Labor is responsible for a continuing evaluation of all programs and activities conducted under CETA, gathering information from the several hundred prime sponsors, evaluating it, and reporting to Congress. To meet their own reporting requirements (as well as to determine what programs merit continued funding), prime sponsors gather information, monitor local program operations, and evaluate the effectiveness of the programs conducted under their jurisdictions. Finally, program operators must provide prime sponsors with evaluation information demonstrating the cost effectiveness of their particular programs, documenting their fulfillment of contractural obligations, and answering other appropriate evaluative questions.

Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for evaluating a classroom training program should be based primarily upon the specific goals and stated purposes of the program and the resulting gains for the clientele it chose to serve. The following questions represent valid measures of program achievement:

1. *Were there jobs at the end of the line for classroom training participants?*

A valid measure of classroom training is the percentage of trainees who are placed in unsubsidized employment at the end of training. Such information indicates whether classroom training was preparing trainees for real, existing jobs in the labor market or whether it was simply compounding frustration by providing them with an unmarketable skill. Of course, consideration should also be given to other kinds of positive terminations from classroom training programs, such as enrollment in higher level education or training programs. Those who make a career of jumping from one training program to another are not positive terminations. But those whose career appetite is whetted by the classroom training experience and who are inspired to seek higher levels of expertise reflect a positive

[12] Frank Reilly, "The Role of Evaluation Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973," *Adherent*, vol. 1, No. 1, October 1974, pp. 48-50.

attitude about their initial classroom training experience. Evaluation should measure positive terminations against non-positive terminations (those who drop out of the program or are unable to find unsubsidized employment).

2. *What kind of post-training wages did classroom training graduates receive?*

It is fair to expect that classroom training graduates will receive higher wages than they would have received if they had not participated in the training program. The only truly dependable measure of such gains is comparison of the post-training wages of the enrollees with the wages of a control group having similar characteristics and the same labor force status at the time the enrollees entered the program. However, for purposes of internal evaluation it is sufficient to add to the pre-training wage the normal trend occurring in that labor market for workers of those characteristics and occupations. A good test is whether the post-training wages are sufficiently above probable earnings without training so that, if the differential continued for several years, a trainee would be better off than if he or she had simply been given the money used for training.

3. *What is the quality of the jobs in which classroom training graduates were placed?*

The desirability and value of classroom training are called into question if graduates are simply placed in entry level, dead end jobs. It is fair to expect that classroom training graduates will be placed in jobs that offer promotional opportunities and clear lines for career advancement. While it is true that classroom training graduates will begin at entry level jobs in many occupational areas, such jobs should be the bottom rung of an occupational ladder rather than a dead end slot with no hope for the future. Entry level jobs should be stepping stones to advancement rather than millstones holding workers back.

4. *Do classroom training graduates stay on the job?*

Job retention is perhaps the best evaluative criterion, because it reflects the satisfaction of both the employer and the employee. Job retention measures the degree to which both the motivational and vocational skills aspects of classroom training have been imparted and absorbed. Classroom training graduates who are both skilled and motivated are likely to stay on the job. Their ability to do the job and their new wage-earning capacity will provide personal satisfaction, and employers will be satisfied with their work performance.

5. *Who participated in the classroom training program?*

It is also fair and valid to ask classroom training program operators if they actually served the needs of those individuals they set out to serve. If a classroom training program set out to serve disadvantaged persons with special needs (such as youth, persons over 45, veterans, welfare recipients, and persons with limited English speaking ability) but ended up providing a vocational holding pattern for unemployed college graduates, quite obviously a negative evaluation would be in order. Evaluation should measure the actual number of "target group" members who were served by the classroom training program, and that number should be weighed against the number of "non-target group" individuals who graduated from the program.

6. *Was the program cost justified?*

A central objective of classroom training programs is to use the limited resources available to provide effective service to the largest possible number of disadvantaged persons. To do so, program planners and operators must hold down costs without compromising program elements that contribute to successful results for their clients. Hence a valid measure of program effectiveness is total cost per trainee placed in unsubsidized employment. Total cost includes all expenditures for administrative, operational, and supportive services as well as trainee stipends.

A program may fulfill its stated goal of serving disadvantaged persons and placing them in unsubsidized jobs but also spend fifteen to twenty thousand dollars per trainee in the process. Such a program cost is clearly excessive. Maximum cost per trainee placed should not exceed three to five thousand dollars. A cost standard in this range should enable a program to make the most beneficial use of its limited funds.

Dangers of Inadequate Criteria

In sum, evaluative criteria should be designed to measure the actual performance of classroom training programs against their planned objectives. Quite simply, evaluation should seek to determine how well a classroom training program did what it set out to do. But there is a danger in restricting evaluative criteria to measures of quantitative results. An overemphasis upon numbers too often "numbs" both prime sponsors and program operators to the quality of the training taking place.

Program operators soon learn the tricks of the training trade with regard to providing quantitative evaluation figures. Some learn to "doctor the data" and become so obsessed with their statistical surgery that they ignore the quality and content of their classroom programs. When the guidelines issued from the highest level of evaluation are unclear, ambiguous, or short-sighted, program operators are encouraged to manipulate placement of figures.

For example, if definitions of "direct" and "indirect" placements are vague, program operators will be able to juggle the figures to present a positive total picture of placement performance. As mentioned earlier, job retention rates are the best indicators of the real value, quality, and effectiveness of classroom training. But job retention rates are worthwhile only if they are based upon a sufficient length of time on the job. Evaluations based upon thirty to ninety day computations tell little about real, long-term job retention. And such evaluations tell absolutely nothing about promotional opportunities and career advancement.

Local prime sponsors should have flexibility in establishing evaluative criteria for programs under their jurisdiction.

When cost effectiveness and other quantitative measures are the sole standard of evaluation, length of training, job placement, and job retention become so paramount in the minds of those whose performance is thus evaluated that they may be encouraged to "cream" their clientele. That is, the program accepts only those trainees who are likely to enhance evaluation statistics. The principle of "survival of the fittest" is too often applied with a new twist. The "fittest" are accepted as clients so that the program may "survive" evaluation requirements. Thus a denial of flexibility in prime sponsor evaluations may work to the further disadvantage of the most disadvantaged potential classroom training clientele and at the same time discourage quality and creativity in individual classroom training programs. Program innovations that might take longer but could produce a better trained client or program approaches designed to reach the heretofore unreachable may become casualties of the demand for cost effectiveness and quantitative results.

Close and earnest evaluation of classroom training programs is absolutely essential, and individual program operators should be held accountable for the dollars they spend. But there is more to financial accountability than cost effectiveness. Accountability means demonstrating a prudent use of financial resources, and such accountability requires a realistic assessment of actual human needs. Training quality and true commitment to serving those most in need are not likely to be measured by simple and rigid cost effectiveness criteria. Classroom training programs may succumb to the temptation to cream from the top of the bottle of human need, and the resulting successful quantitative measures may taste ever so sweet, but the rest of the bottle will turn sour. Some flexibility should be allowed in evaluation guidelines so that homogenizing will replace creaming in serving the real needs of the most severely disadvantaged.

Writing in the October 1974, issue of *Adherent*, Frank Reilly called attention to the inadequacy (and often inaccuracy) of evaluative standards designed to measure quantitative results:

> Because many local prime sponsors will not have trained manpower experts on their staffs, there will be a tendency to use extremely simplified evaluation methodology. There is an inherent danger in this approach, not because a *complicated* method of evaluation is better than a *simple* evaluation, but because a simplified methodology may easily bring an inaccurate evaluation.
>
> There are inherent dangers in over-reliance on cost benefit analysis as a means of evaluating manpower training programs. A major ingredient that is lacking in the evaluative data being gathered under CETA programming is the effect of concomitant benefits that are realized through manpower training efforts. There are many concomitant benefits which do not appear on the professional evaluators' graphs and tables or on the cost benefit analysts' charts and measurement devices. The major benefit overlooked in the rush to put a price tag on every stage of the program is "human dignity." The actual and honest experience of unemployed, disadvantaged, and minority individuals moving off the welfare rolls onto the employment rolls. The benefits that this movement creates are highly important to the evaluation of a program's effectiveness.[1]

Reilly sees two "stages" of evaluation as necessary and operating side by side in measuring both quality and quantity: "formative" evaluation, which assesses the quality of training as it is going on, and "summative" evaluation, which measures the end result. Formative evaluation is a tool for program improvement, and summative evaluation is a measure of program performance and fulfillment of contractual agreement.

As in all other aspects of the classroom training process, evaluation must be designed to serve the real needs of the unemployed, the underemployed, and the unemployable. Cost effectiveness is a must for classroom training programs because the goal is to serve the maximum number of people in acute need of training. But cost effectiveness standards must never encourage program operators to exclude those whose level of disadvantagement does not allow them to keep up with a pre-established pace; nor should financial accountability become a barrier to true concern for quality training.

Competition Among Training Services

A final means of evaluation, which measures both qualitative and quantitative results, is comparison among classroom training programs. Too often local community-based classroom training programs are eliminated, and classroom training services are taken over by local governments—with the justification of "avoiding duplication of services." With the unemployment rate alarmingly high for certain groups and the chasm between poverty and privilege widening, leaving large numbers of minority group people in the official ranks of poverty, there is certainly plenty of room for healthy competition among classroom training programs and a need for a "free enterprise" system to deliver employment and training services.

A structured, conscious competition among classroom training programs and other employment and training delivery systems can result in better program performance by all competitors. Parallel programs operating side by side can keep individual program operators on their toes. And the real beneficiaries of the pressures and demands of comparative evaluation are those most in need of quality classroom training services.

[1] Ibid., pp. 50-51.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1978 O—270-805

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

For more information, contact the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20213, or any of the Regional Administrators for Employment and Training whose addresses are listed below.

Location	States Served	
John F. Kennedy Bldg. Boston, Mass. 02203	Connecticut Maine Massachusetts	New Hampshire Rhode Island Vermont
1515 Broadway New York, N.Y. 10036	New Jersey New York Canal Zone	Puerto Rico Virgin Islands
P.O. Box 8796 Philadelphia, Pa. 19101	Delaware District of Columbia Maryland	Pennsylvania Virginia West Virginia
1371 Peachtree Street, NE. Atlanta, Ga. 30309	Alabama Florida Georgia Kentucky	Mississippi North Carolina South Carolina Tennessee
230 South Dearborn Street Chicago, Ill. 60604	Illinois Indiana Michigan	Minnesota Ohio Wisconsin
911 Walnut Street Kansas City, Mo. 64106	Iowa Kansas	Missouri Nebraska
555 Griffin Square Bldg. Dallas, Tex. 75202	Arkansas Louisiana New Mexico	Oklahoma Texas
1961 Stout Street Denver, Colo. 80294	Colorado Montana North Dakota	South Dakota Utah Wyoming
450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, Calif. 94102	Arizona California Hawaii Nevada	American Samoa Guam Trust Territory
909 First Avenue Seattle, Wash. 98174	Alaska Idaho	Oregon Washington